УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ У БАЊОЈ ЛУЦИ ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

ФИЛОЛОГ ЧАСОПИС ЗА ЈЕЗИК, КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И КУЛТУРУ



THE PORTRAIT OF WILD (IN THE COLLOCATIONAL TECHNIQUE)

Abstract: The author's collocational method is applied to the adjective wild, with a view to find scientific definitions for all its lexical meanings. At the same time the analysis serves as an illustration of the process used when applying the method in general.

Key words: collocation, seme, sememe, classeme, cryptotype, lexical definition.

The title above plays a pun on *The* Portrait of Dorian Gray, the novel by Oscar Wilde, but its purport is serious - to define the lexical meanings of the adjective wild by means of the collocational method¹. This method has been developed and applied on several occasions by the present author (as in Hlebec 1998, 2003, 2007, 2008с, 2010; Хлебец 2002, 2008a, 2008b). The results of the application of this method intersect and overlap with those to be found in the works of other authors². However, being the only elaborated inductive approach to lexical collocations, it provides additional and original insight and aims at a systematic theoretical approach to the semantic analysis of specific languages.

Present-day lexicography has reached a high level of sophistication and precision. Yet, for reasons of user-friendliness, its definitions cannot be identified with definitions achieved by a rigorous lexicological method. In order to gain insight into true semantic definitions, the following phases in the collocational method will be followed (Hlebec 2007: 39; Hlebec 2010: 107–109):

As a first step, a list of relevant **collocations of the lexeme** is to be provided. In our example, it means that the investigators would have at their disposal adjective + noun collocations like *wild accusa-*

tion/ affair/ applause/ argument/ cheer/ child/ claim/ day/ do/ dream/ excess/ flower/ fluctuation/ fury/ guess/ happiness/ hysterics/ idea/ imagination/ laughter/ life/ look/ mountain/ native/ night/ party/ people/ pitch/ place/ promise/ rumour/ scheme/ sea/ shooting/ shopping/ spree/ shot/ storm/ student/ temper/ throw/ time/ variation/ weather/ wind/ youth etc.; verb + adjective collocations go/run (intransitive) wild, drive (transitive) wild, adjective + preposition + noun collocations wild with excitement/rage/terror, as well as the syntactic frame (sb) be wild about sb/ sth.

As a second step, **polysemy** (i.e. different lexical meanings (sememes) of the given lexeme) is determined. Present-day monolingual dictionaries of the English language offer a fairly reliable division into different senses, but if in doubt, the test of zeugma is available for this purpose. For example, in His wild accusations and happiness astonished his friends, wild cannot be taken to refer to *happiness* because in wild happiness it constitutes a separate sememe, distinct from wild in wild accusations. In the same way, the normal sentence He was wild with rage and terror at the same time indicates that wild with the element 'angry' and wild with 'afraid' can be treated as members of the same sememe (as allosemes) since no zeugma occurred.

As a third step, a number of **collocates of the given seme** are to be identified. Thus we can provide *claim*, *promise*, *guess*, and *rumour* in addition to *accusation* as the noun collocates of the adjective *wild*_X. The collocates of *wild*_Y other than *happiness*, have been found to be *fury*, *temper*, and *hysterics*.

Now we can proceed to search for the **common content of the collocates** in each sememe. The common denominator of the nouns *accusation*, *claim*, *promise*, *guess*, and *rumour* is 'talking' or, in other words, to atomize the notion of 'talking' and widen it so as to include writing – 'something caused by use of language'. What semantically unites *happiness*, *fury*, *temper*, and *hysterics* is 'strong emotion'.

In order to reach the complete definitions of $wild_X$ and $wild_Y$, just as of any other adjective or verb, it is necessary to incorporate the information on the combining nouns. That part of a definition is called *directive*, and to mark it we use a pair of hashes (symbols # #). The central part of the definition is called *analysis* (after Wiggins 1971: 26). This data has already been obtained by finding the common content of the noun collocates. Thus, #sth caused by use of language# is the directive for $wild_X$ and #strong emotion# for $wild_Y$.

The primary meanings of wild, those in which the adjective collocates with nouns denoting living things and places, are the oldest, attested already in Old English. So we start with provisional definitions for these meanings and proceed with others initially relying on information provided by dictionaries (SOED, ICED, COBUILD, MODEL, and OALD):

 $wild_1$ (as in wild animal/ flower/ rabbit/ dog/ strawberry/ rose, plants grow wild)

<#living thing other than man# that
lives or grows in natural conditions, not
raised by man>

wild₂ (as in wild moorland/ mountain; wild mountainous regions; The island is a wild and lonely place) <#place# that is in its natural state, not changed by man>

wild3 (previously wildx; as in wild accusation/ claim/ promise/ guess/ rumour)
<#sth caused by use of language# with too
little accuracy>

wild 4a (as in wild children/ students; The boy is wild and completely out of control; the crowd went wild; Those boys have been allowed to run wild) <#sb# who behaves without control>

wild_{4b} (as in He has turned out very wild) <#sb# who behaves without moral control> (marked as 'specific' usage in SOED)

 $wild_{\rm 4C}$ (as in He was wild with rage, It makes me wild to see such waste; The noise drove him wild with terror) <#sb# who is very angry/afraid>

wild_{4d} (as in She's totally wild about him; I'm not wild about the idea; He was wild to sing) <#sb# who is very enthusiastic>

wild_{4e} (as in The fans/ audience went
wild; wild with joy) <#sb# who expresses
strong emotions, feeling good>

wild_{5a} (previously wild_y; as in wild happiness/fury/temper/hysterics) <#strong emotion# that is very strong>

wild_{5b} (as in wild excess/ abandon/ abandonment/ argument/ fluctuation/ variation/ action) <#event# that is caused without control [typ.of behaviour]>

wild_{5C} (as in wild idea/hope/scheme; Let your imagination run wild and be creative; Their schemes began to sound wilder and wilder; beyond my wildest dreams) <#mental event# that is free, without any control>

wild_{5d} (as in wild look/ eyes/ cheer/
applause/ laughter/ weeping; Her eyes were
wild) <#sb's expression# that is full of very
strong emotion>

wild_{5e} (as in wild adventure/ shopping spree, wild and romantic love affair; They have some pretty wild parties. This trip has

been really wild) <#sb's event# that is exciting because it is without control>

wild_{5f} (as in wild attack/ blow/ movement; make a wild dash at the door) <#body event# that is very strong and caused angrily>

wild_{5g} (as in wild youth/days/life; We
had a wild time in New York) <#time# when
sb lives without restraint>

wild_{5h} (as in wild voice) <#sb's sound#
that is strong and unrestrained>

wild₆ (as in wild night/ weather/ wind/ sea/ storm) <#nature/weather# that is very strong and bad>

wild7 (as in wild native/ man/ tribe)
<#sb# who is uncivilized, uncultured>

wild8 (as in wild people) <#sb# who is
rebellious>

wild₉ (as in The Chinese shells 'went
wild') < #thing# that is aimed at without
precision>

 $wild_{1O}$ (as in wild shooting/ shot/ throw/pitch) < #event of moving a thing# that is aimed at without care>

 $wild_{11}$ (as in $wild\ taste$) <#event caused by a living thing other than man# that is not under control of man>

 $wild_{12}$ (as in $wild\ mineral/ore$) <#substance in the ground# that is not pure [which is typ. bad] >

wild₁₃ (as in The misery drove her
wild) <#sb# who has mental disorder>

wild₁₄ (as in wild hair; His hair was
wild) <#sb's hair# that is long an untidy>

 $wild_{15}$ (as in $wild\ notes$) <#event# that is unconventional or fantastic in appearance>

So far the semantic material for the analyses has been tentative. In order to refine it and reduce it to scientifically valid semes, we shall take the following observations into consideration.

The meanings of $wild_{4a}$ and $wild_{4b}$ can be covered by one definition because moral control is only a specific kind of control, the hyperonym control being already mentioned in $wild_{4a}$.

The collocations go wild_{4a}, $_{4e}$, $_{9}$ and run wild_{4a}, _{5C} are in parallel with *go adrift/* aground/ bald/ grey/ haywire/ lame/ hungry/ native/ sour/ wrong and run aground/ amok/ dry/ high/ late/ low/ scared/ short respectively. The common meaning of the adjectives that collocate with go (= 'become') is 'state that is not normal' or, often, 'bad unexpected state', which simply amounts to 'bad'. The adjective collocates with run (= 'become') seem to have the same meaning, except for the greater emphasis conveyed by run than by go due to the reflected-and-shadow meaning effect3. Therefore we have to accommodate meanings of 'state that is not normal' when creating definitions for $wild_{4a}$, $_{4e}$, $_{5c}$ and $_{9}$.

The collocations on par with *drive* wild (in wild_{4C} and ₁₃), i. e. *drive* crazy/ insane/ mad, as well as *drive* to despair, indicate 'a state of the lack of mental control' as a common content of these adjectives, and *drive* can be paraphrased as <#sb₁# causes #sb₂# to lose mental control>.

The semes $wild_{4C}$ and $wild_{4e}$ can be followed by the preposition with, which simply shows that a person **has** a kind of emotion.

The seme *wild*_{4d} is followed by the preposition *about* and therefore it is restricted to the predicate position. The preposition *about* indicates the seme 'having a strong thought thinking of #sth#', as in *Tell me about it*, *There's nothing you can do about it now* (OALD s.v. *about*).

The sememes $wild_{4d}$ and $_{4e}$ can be lumped together technically because to show an emotion presupposes that the experiencer **has** the emotion, but very dubious acceptability of *He went wild with joy about the idea confirms the conclusion that. wild $_{4d}$ and $_{4e}$ should be kept apart as distinct sememes.

For practical purposes, and in order to highlight a close connection between the meanings, we can also conflate the definitions of $wild_{5a}$ and $wild_{5d}$, as well as of $wild_{0}$ and $_{10}$, although they all still belong

in different sememes (as proven by zeugma, as in *Her fury and eyes were wild or His wild fury and eyes surprised her (wild cannot refer to eyes here). For the same reason and with the same implications, we have coupled $wide_1$ and $_{11}$ together.

Now we can substitute theoretically more sophisticated definitions for the practical dictionary definitions that we have used so far.

Brackets within a directive have an important function, different from that within an analysis. They are a sign that the connection between the directive and its analysis is indirect, which often restricts the adjective lexeme to an attribute-only position (see Hlebec 2003, 2007, 2010).

A wild animal4 (of wild₁) is one that is not easily brought under control, unlike tame(d) animal, while a wild plant is a plant without care, not cultivated, i.e. not controlled by man. Also, wild mountain or wild place (wild₂) refer to places in a natural state, not under control of man and therefore uninhabited. So we come with #(event caused by) creature other than man# and #place# as directives for $wild_{1/11}$ and $wild_{2}$ respectively, whereas they all share 'without control' or 'not controlled' as the analyses.

A revised list of *wild*'s sememes is as follows:

 $wild_{1/11}$ <#(event caused by) living thing other than man# that is not controlled by man>

wild₂ <#place in nature# that is not
controlled by man>

 $wild_3$ <#sth₁ caused by use of language# by sb₁ without control of sth₁>

wild_{4a/b} <#sb# who behaves without
control>

wild_{4C} <#sb# who has a bad emotion
that is without control>

 $wild_{4d/e}$ <#sb₁# who has (and shows) an emotion that is without control because sb_1 has a strong thought thinking that sb/sth_1 is very good (and wants to do sth_2)> $wild_{5a/5d}$ <#(sb₁'s expression that shows) a strong emotion# that is without control>

wild_{5b} <#event [typ. sb's event]# that
is caused without control >

wild_{5C} <#mental event# that is caused
without control>

wild_{5e} <#sb₁'s event# that happens
without sb₁'s control, which sb₁ finds exciting>

wild_{5f} <#sb₁'s body event# that is caused without sb₁'s control of emotions>

 $wild_{5g}$ <#sb₁'s time# that is spent without control caused by sb₂ having power> $wild_{5h}$ <#sb's sound# that is strong and without control>

wild6 <#nature/weather# that people
cannot control [which is bad]>

wild₇ <#sb# who has not brought nature sufficiently under control>

wild8 <#sb₁# who shows that they do
not want to be controlled by sb₂ ruling>

 $wild_{9/10}$ < #(event of moving thing in) a weapon# that is aimed at without enough control of senses when aiming>

 $wild_{12}$ <#substance in the ground# that is not pure [which is typ. bad]>

 wild_{13} <#sb# who has mental disorder>

 $wild_{14}$ <#sb's hair# that is without control>

 $wild_{15}$ <#event# that is very unlike usual events>

SOED, OAELD and MODEL, as probably other dictionaries as well, mention 'lack of control' sporadically, while we have found it to be the most important unifying semantic element occurring in almost all the sememes. Thus SOED has 'uncontrolled' for $wild_6$, 'not submitting to moral control' for $wild_{4b}$, and 'not having control of one's mental faculties' for $wild_{13}$. In OALD we can find 'out of control' for $wild_{4a}$ and the explanation "If children or animals run wild, they behave as they like because nobody is controlling them". The noun phrase the wild has been glossed as 'a

natural environment that is not controlled by people', while *wilderness* is said to be a place that people do not take care of or control. The adverb *wildly* is explained by the words 'in a way that is not controlled'. MODEL has 'in a natural or uncontrolled way' for *wild*₁ and 'in an uncontrolled way' for *wildly*.

'State that is not usual' has been incorporated in the definitions of *wild*_{4a}, 4b, 4e, 5c and 9 implicitly, since the lack of control is certainly such a state.

The sememe *wild*₇ poses a problem. Instead of 'who does not control nature sufficiently' one could also suggest 'whose way of life is very simple' or some other competing definition like 'who does not control his/her inner nature'. The ultimate decision lies in further research, but the fact that modern dictionaries warn against the usage of *wild* in this sense indicates that the last definition is most likely to be (almost) the right one.

That wild_{4C} and _e go together as one sememe is proven by the lack of zeugma in Half the stadium were wild with rage and the other half with joy or First she was wild with rage and then with joy or First she was wide with rage and then with joy.

The items $wild_{5b}$ <#event# that is caused without control > and $wild_{5c}$ <#mental event# that is caused without control > obviously share the same analysis, while the directive of the former is the hyperonym of the latter. This indicates that the conflation of these two allosemes is required.

Similarly, the items $wild_{5b}$ <#event [typ. sb's event]# that is caused without control > and $wild_{5e}$ <#sb₁'s event# that happens without sb₁'s control, which sb₁ finds exciting> make a natural whole and should not be treated as separate sememes (cf. *His actions and excesses were wild*). Excitement is a contextual feature and instead of it we propose the seme 'strong', which enables the predicative use (cf. Hlebec 2010;80).

Although *wild*_{5C} and _{5f} do not seem to tolerate zeugma because mental and body events are too wide apart,. but we have decided to lump them together for the sake of simplicity.

We have conjoined wild_{4e} and wild_{5a} in a single definition <#sb₁# who has (and shows) an emotion that is without control because sb₁ thinks that sb/sth is very good> for a different reason. Namely, $wild_{Ae}$ collocates with the preposition with, which contains 'have'. Therefore 'have' is a seme that has to appear in the definition of wil d_{5a} . Since $wild_{4e}$ already contains 'have', wild_{4e} and _{5a} naturally go together. Furthermore, to wild₄ and _{5d} one can apply Apresjan's observation on regular synonymy of intelligent/stupid man - intelligent/ stupid look/answer, sad/merry boy - sad/ merry eyes/smiles, honest/sly person honest/sly person question, while his example of regular synonymy in agile/awkward animals - agile/awkward movements (2000: 15) corresponds to our conjoining $wild_1$ and $_{11}$.

Finally, we are going to conflate the definitions for all $wild_4$'s and $wild_5$'s in one complex definition. Those of $wild_4$ are represented by 'sb/sth' out of the brackets (within the directive), while those of $wild_5$ are represented by the expansion within the brackets in the directive. The brackets within the analysis mainly indicate allosemes, but when used here for the insertion of 'and shows', different sememes are implied, as mentioned above.

 $wild_{4/5}$ < #(event₁ [typ. behaviour]/ emotion/time of) sb_1/sth_1 # that causes event₁ without control (when sb_1 has (and shows) a strong emotion) (because sb_1 has a strong thought thinking that sb_2/sth_2 is very good) (and wants to do sth_3)>.

 $Wild_{4a}$ and $_{4c}$, as well as $wild_{4}$ and $_{5}$ form the relationship of metonymy.

Various semes within the directive, separated by slashes, (i.e. 'event, 'emotion' and 'time') produce different sememes, since in *The wild time and excesses he had*

in Paris worried his parents, wild cannot refer to excesses. These semes have been joined here in an umbrella definition for the sake of abridgement, and at the same time, such a definition more prominently highlights the close relations between the semes of different sememes. The notions of 'mental event', 'body event', 'voice' and 'behaviour' are included in the notion of event as its hyponyms. In Her wild behaviour and voice shocked the people, wild can be understood to refer to voice.

Most frequently it is a person (sb of the directive in $wild_{4/5}$) and only occasionally something (sth), as in wild fluctuation (of sth), that is realized in speech or text.

Now we can search for the semes 'without control' or simply 'control' in lexemes other than *wild*, which would, if found, bring them out as important recurrent semantic elements in English. We are going to use the same procedure as observed for *wild*.

In the English language there are synonymous nouns abandon and abandonment, which we mentioned above in the collocations with *wild*_{5b} <#event [typ. behaviour] # that is caused without control>. The nouns abandon and abandonment are like adventure and excess in denoting behaviour without control by default, even when standing without the support of the adjective wild. This is in contradistinction to the other two nouns in the directive of *wild*_{5b} – *fluctuation* and *action*, which are simply 'event', referring to a behaviour without control only when collocating with wild. If abandon(ment) can be defined as < behaviour that is caused without control because sb has a strong emotion>5, then the corresponding verb to abandon in collocations like abandon oneself to grief/despair/impulses/passion has to share some semes with abandon(ment). The nouns *grief/despair/impulses/passion* all denote bad and strong emotions/ thoughts. Therefore, for to abandon oneself to we suggest <#sb₁# causes #sb₁# to be

without control and experiences (as if moves to) a bad and strong emotion/tho-ught>. Another lexeme that contains 'without control' in its analysis is the adjective *unruly*. However, we could not find any lexeme whose directive contained 'without control' and have to conclude that, pending further evidence, 'without control' can occur only as part of a noun definition or of an analysis. Now let us search for the seme 'control' in a directive.

In Bugarski (1996: 205-209) quite a lot of utterances containing the preposition *under*₉ can be found. They provide us with a sufficient number of collocations such that can lead to a definition by means of the collocational method. These nouns (or noun phrases and pronouns) are: *Ed*ward the Third, king, the Antonines, a totalitarian régime, the stern dictatorship of Ada, the injustice of government tyranny, (serve under) him, instructions, (you will be under) Mr Weedin, that man, the doctor, her domination, orders, any management, Peter's direction, Isabella's quidance, he lax tuition of Mr Ellis, your care, (keep us there under) his eye, the sergeant-majorly supervision, observation, their patronizing and hostile stares, the gaze, his laboriously constructed microscope of detachment, control (4 times), a reasonable degree of restraint, judgement, examination, treatment, notice to leave, penalty, arrest, lock and key, suspicion. When discussing the meanings of under_Q, trying to capture their essence, the author has stated: "Under ovde označava podređenost ili izloženost nekoj formi autoriteta: vladavini, naređenjima, posmatranju, kontroli, rukovodstvu i sl., pri čemu je nosilac toga autoriteta imenica u položaju njegovog objekta".6 Thus, although in an unemphatic way, because his task was unlike ours, Bugarski finely shows that he is aware of the common meaning of the noun collocates and of the semantic link between the preposition under (as well as other prepositions) and its nominal object. It is symptomatic

that it is the noun *control* that occurs most frequently as the object of under_Q.

We can easily see that $under_9$ means submission to a kind of control, while the object noun denotes the source of control (as Bugarski has rightly observed), which is the opposite of the various senses of wild. A conclusion imposes itself that the noun collocates of $under_9$ contain the seme 'causing control', which is at the same time the directive of the preposition $under_9$. This furnishes us with the definition of $under_9$ as experiencing #control*>, and it proves that 'control' is a classeme7 and, moreover, a cryptotype8 in the English language.

Since the predominant, if not the sole, meaning of *wild* is 'without control' (= 'not controlled by sb/sth'), it is no wonder that most of the sememes contain passive situations in their definitions. Moreover, using the collocational method in the same way as we have done for *wild*, the cryptotype **control** via its corresponding lexeme *control* can be further reduced to its constituent elements as <event when sb₁/sth₁ causes sb₂/sth₂ to be in a such a state that sb₁ is stronger than sb₂/sth₂ (which event typ. prevents sb₂ from doing sth₃ bad/sth₂ from being bad)>.

In active sentences the subject is an agent, while in passive ones the agent is expressed as an object, the subject position being taken by the affected entity. 'Somebody' in <#sb₂# behaves without control>, derived from <#sb₂# who behaves without control>, plays the role of AGENT, but the underlying idea stemming from 'without control' is that sb₂ should be AFFECTED, since 'control' implies a strong agent manifested in sb₁, i.e. the person who exerts control. In the meanings of wild such a natural, controlling agent is absent, because the affected entity has freed itself from control to become the actual agent, represented in the directive. However, sb₂ is still mentally tied to sb₁, the controller, which shows in the analyses no matter how

we frame it – in terms of 'be without control', 'out of control', 'not having control', 'be uncontrolled'. or 'not submitting to control'. The analyses always point to the passive relationship 'not controlled by sb/sth'.

That wild contains or is associated with the notion of strength in quite many senses is attested by wildly used to emphasize that a quality is very great indeed (in informal usage), as in wildly erratic behaviour, wildly romantic book or wildly inefficient (COBUILD).

The compounds wild card 'sb who might behave in an unexpected way' and wildfire 'a fire that is not under control and spreads quickly' confirm the omnipresent complex seme 'without control'. The notion of the lack of control, which unifies all sememes of wild, basically and predominantly carries negative evaluation, since disorder, chaos and entropy have to be incessantly fought against by some kind of control. A characteristic of ordered societies is placing emphasis on the control of elemental forces, human behaviour, and production of goods, while 'savage' (or wild) communities, lack such control. However, in $wild_{4d/4e}$ it is 'good' that seems to occur as a seme, rather than 'bad'.

For the time being we can only say that the good is a matter of measure, a thin line across the sea of the evil, dividing it into halves: one part being deviation from the good in one direction and the other from the good in the opposite direction. As language proves, quite a lot of lexemes that express 'good' by definition can collocate with too or overly or excessively. These three lexemes are stronger and they change the evaluation of the former lexemes from 'good' to 'bad'. As a truism, control is good only if it serves a good purpose. Its opposite, the lack of control, can be bad and most frequently it is so. Man can also (endeavour to) achieve or experience too much of control, which is tautologically also bad. In that case the opposite of the latter, i.e. diminishing or relaxing control, would be good. In other words we are inclined to believe that an explosive non-violent expression of positive feelings on some occasions (such as public manifestations) can be salutary and therapeutic, just as it is good to have a cure for a disease. This phenomenon indicates that in Anglo-Saxon societies some groups of people ($wild_{Ad}$ is in colloquial usage!) consider control of behaviour to be a burden, which triggers unruly behaviour. Relaxation for them seems to be an escape from an overly ordered way of life in which emotions are to be harnessed and kept under strict control9. In slang, especially American, wild means 'excellent, special and/or unusual' (CIDE) or 'exciting, wonderful' (CDS), as in The music they play is just wild (CIDE s. v. wild). This usage has been left out from the list in this article, but it is worth mentioning here, where it indicates that speakers of slang, mostly people who often defy ordered life, find uncontrolled behaviour attractive. "Slang is the counter-language. [...] The language of the rebel, the outlaw, the despised, the marginal, the young [... It] is endlessly resilient, inventive and untameable" (CDS: v).

However, prevention is better than cure. It is better not to have disease at all and, moreover, some medicines can have adverse effects as a by-product10. In that sense, occasional "larking about" and "raves" are only relatively good, while serenity (= control) of mind is universally good¹¹. But, after all, the definition of wild_{4d} does **not** say that wild behaviour is (ever) good; it only says that the subject behaves wildly because he/she feels good. The wisdom of language is greater than the sanity of its individual users, and, strictly speaking, apart from slang usage, there is no one sememe of wild that manifests positive evaluation. $Wild_{4e}$ fits into the slot after go, which indicates 'bad' just like wil d_{4a} and o.

References

- "A lexicographic portrait is an exhaustive account of all the linguistically relevant properties of a lexeme, with particular emphasis on the semantic motivation of its formal properties" (Apresjan 2000: xvi).
- Notably J. R. Firth (1957), Neo-Firthians (R. M. W. Dixon 2005, Angus Mc-Intosh 1961), the Moscow School (Igor Mel'čuk 1987, Juri Apresjan 1973), and Wiggins (1971) among others.
- 3 Mentioned in Leech (1990: 16) and Chafe (2000).
- 4 'Wild animal' occurs as a part of the definition of the noun lexeme *cub* ('baby of a wild animal').
- 5 In (Hlebec 2007 and 2010) the definition is almost identical: sb's typ. bad | behaviour that is in disorder | because | sb has |a strong | feeling
- 6 "Under here signifies submission or exposure to a form of authority: rule, orders, observation, control, leadership, and the like, where the holder of authority is denoted by the noun in the position of its object."
- There have been other usages of the term *classeme* (e.g. Coseriu & Geckeler 1974) that should not be mixed up with the one presented here, which is 'a seme that is indispensable for defining a lexical meaning'. Other semes, which only serve the purpose of linking classemes in a lexical definition, are 'empty' semes. Anna Wierzbicka (1988: 345).considers the verb *have*, as in *John has the children* to include 'under control' in its definition.
- We have decided to use the term *cryptotype* in honour of Benjamin Lee Whorf, who used it in a similar way. To quote an instance of cryptotype, Whorf claimed that in Hopi, falling, tumbling, spilling, jumping, whirling, going out and going in make up a cryptotype which governs the use of the aspect and

tense forms (1956: 73). For Whorf "[cryptotype] is a submerged, subtle, and elusive meaning, corresponding to no actual word, yet shown by linguistic analysis to be functionally important in the grammar. For example, the English particle UP meaning 'completely, to a finish,' as in 'break it up, cover it up, eat it up, twist it up, open it up' can be applied to any verb of one or two syllables initially accented, EXCEPTING verbs belonging to four special cryptotypes" (1956: 70). In our use of the same term, cryptotype is a simple classeme, and it is not restricted to grammar but includes lexis. Thus, body | event is a classeme that consists of two cryptotypes: **body** and **event**.

- 9 The same phenomenon can be observed in Serbian *ludo se provesti* (lit. 'have a mad time') for *have a wild time*.
- This most obviously happens under oppression (private or society-wide) and tyranny. A mutiny or revolution appears to be the righteous (= good) way to abolish them, but, again, mutiny and revolution by themselves produce negative aftermath.
- "[C]ontrol is a cornerstone of mental health being able to manage your mood, temper or attitude is a key component of staying sane" (Persaud 1998: 62).

Bibliography

- 1. Apresjan, Juri (1973), 'A description of semantics by means of syntax', *Linguistics* 96: 5–32.
- 2. Apresjan, Juri (2000), *Systematic Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 3. Chafe, Wallace I. (2000), *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- 4. Coseriu, E. & Geckeler, H. (1974), 'Linguistics and semantics' in: Sebeok,

- Thomas A. (ed.), *Current Trends In Linguistics* 3. The Hague: Mouton, 103–171.
- 5. Dixon R. M. W. (2005), *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 6. Firth, John Rupert (1957), *Papers in Linguistics* 1934–1951. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 7. Hlebec, Boris (1998), Connect Your Words. A Dictionary of Collocations. Belgrade; Trebnik.
- 8. Хлебец, Борис (2002) 'Лексичкосемантичка анализа српских придева са значењем једне димензије', *Српски језик* 7/1–2: 213–236.
- 9. Hlebec, Boris (2003), 'Connectivity and indirect connection in English', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 39: 113–120.
- 10. Hlebec, Boris (2007), *English Semantics*, Belgrade: Čigoja štampa.
- 11. Хлебец, Борис (2008а), 'Колокацијска метода семантичке анализе (на примеру именице пажња', Семантичка проучавања српског језика. Српски језик у светлу савремених лингвистичких теорија, књ. 12. САНУ: 65–79.
- 12. Хлебец, Борис (2008b), '"Предикативни инструментал" у светлу колокацијске анализе', *Јужнословенски филолог* 64: 535–550.
- 13. Hlebec, Boris (2008c), 'Collocations with *old*, *young* and *new* and their Serbian correspondents', Belgrade: *ELL-SACC Proceedings* Vol. I, 171–192.
- 14. Hlebec, Boris (2010), English Semantics for University Students. Belgrade: Čigoja štampa.
- 15. Leech, Geoffrey (1990), *Semantics. The Study of Meaning*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- 16. McIntosh, Angus (1961), "Patterns and ranges', *Language* 37 No 3, part I: 325–337.
- 17. Mel'čuk, Igor (1987), 'From meaning to text. Semantic representation in the meaning-text linguistic theory and a new type of monolingual dictionary',

Boris Hlebec

- Work papers vol. 31: 73–125. Summer Institute of Linguistics. Grand Forks N D: University of N. Dakota
- 18. Persaud, Raj (1998), *Staying Sane*. London: Metro.
- 18. Whorf, Benjamin Lee (1956), *Language*, *Thought and Realty*, *Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT.
- 17. Wiggins D. (1971), 'On sentence-sense, word-sense and difference of word-sense: Towards a philosophical theory of dictionaries' in: Steinberg, D D & Jakobovits, L. A. (eds.), *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 4–14.

Dictionaries

1. CDS Jonathan Green (1998), *The Cassell Dictionary of Slang*. London: Cassell

- 2. CIDE *Cambridge International Dictionary of English* (1995), Cambridge: Cambridge
- 3. University Press.
- 4. COBUILD Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary (1987). London
- 5. /Glasgow: Collins
- 6. MEDAL Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners (2007). 2nd ed.
- 7. Oxford: Macmillan/A&CB.
- 8. OALD Hornby, A, S. (2000), Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current
- 9. *English* (Sally Wehmeier ed.). 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- 10. SOED The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles (1974). C.T.
- 11. Onions (ed.) 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ПОРТРЕТ ПРИДЈЕВА *WILD* (У КОЛОКАЦИЈСКОЈ ТЕХНИЦИ)

Резиме

Аутор анализира сва значења придјева wild, уједно илуструјући поступак при коришћењу колокацијске методе како ју је осмислио. Закључује да у ужем дијелу дефиниција (у тзв. анализама) свих лексичких значења придјева wild заједнички дио представља појам одсуства контроле, и доказује да је семантички елемент (сема) 'контрола' (у смислу овладавања) заправо криптотип у енглеском језику, тј. да чини језички и лингвистички битан појам који учествује у градњи сложенијих лексикализованих појмова.

boris.jesensek@gmail.com